REMARKS

The Official Action of August 23, 2005, and the prior art relied upon therein have been carefully reviewed. The claims in the application are now claims 1, 2, 5, 7-17 and 19-23, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance.

Applicants have claimed priority from their corresponding application filed in Sweden on June 27, 2003, and have filed a certified copy of same. Accordingly, **acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 would be appreciated.**

Claims 3, 4, 6, 15, 18 and 19 have only been objected to, i.e. they have not been rejected on any grounds including the prior art. Accordingly, applicants understand that these claims are deemed by the PTO to not only define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103, but also to meet all other requirements for patentability. This is confirmed in paragraph 8 of the Office Action appearing near the bottom of page 7.

Accordingly, allowable claims 3, 4 and 6 have been deleted and rewritten in independent form as new claim 21. Claim 18 has been deleted and has been rewritten in

independent form as new claim 22, with new claim 23 (which is dependent on claim 22) having its dependent portion the same as that of allowable claim 19. Accordingly, claims 21-23 should be in condition for formal allowance.

Claims 1, 2 and 7 have been rejected under Section 102 as anticipated by Edgar et al USP 4,465,929 ("Edgar"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the solid body is formed of a number of solid compounds and a solid substrate. These amendments have support at least in the description on page 10, lines 8-15. Further, claim 1 has been amended in order to more clearly define its intended subject matter. The text "...and a substrate having scattering properties ..." has been amended by adding"... and a substrate, the substrate having scattering properties..." to clarify that it is the substrate that has the scattering properties. Support may be found at page 9, line 37, page 10, line 3.

Edgar discloses a calibration standard for an infrared absorption gauge. The calibration standard comprises flat glass discs with spectrally selective absorption, wherein the flat glass discs may be coated with a coating which has a spectrally unselective absorption (see column 8, lines 10-23). Edgar does not disclose a substrate having scattering

properties similar to a product to be analyzed and being spectrally neutral in a wavelength range to be used in the analysis instrument. The Edgar coating is not a substrate and it further does not imitate the scattering properties of a product. The coating merely reduces the intensity level detected by providing a uniform absorption over a wavelength range.

According to Edgar, the absorption spectra of components B and E is similar to that of the material or sample which is to be measured by the gauge (see column 6, lines 56-59). However, as may be seen in Fig. 1, the spectrum of the components is merely arranged to have absorption peaks at the same wavelengths as a material to be analyzed. Thus, the calibration standard is not able to imitate the spectral response with respect to intensity, wavelength and scattering properties. The calibration standard of Edgar imitates the spectral response with respect to only wavelength absorption peaks, but does not imitate or even resemble the spectral response with respect to intensity.

Although Edgar indicates that spectrally unselective absorption means are provided to reduce the signal levels to values comparable with those that would be received from the sample in the sample zone (see column 6, lines 1-12), the

calibration standard does not give a spectral response that imitates the intensity at each wavelength.

Therefore, Edgar does not disclose a reference standard comprising a solid body imitating the spectral response of a sample to be analyzed with respect to intensity, wavelength and scattering properties.

It should be clear that Edgar does not anticipate claim 1 and therefore also does not anticipate claims 2 and 7 which depend from and incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection therefore is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-14, 16, 17 and 20 have been rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Anderson et al USP 5,933,792 ("Andersen"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 has been amended in that "... a reference standard comprising a solid body .." is changed to "... a reference standard according to claim 1...". As claim 10 now depends from and incorporates the subject matter of claim 1, it will be clear that claim 10 (and the claims which depend therefrom) define novel subject matter. Further in this regard, Andersen does not disclose a reference standard as called for in claim 10 which recites recording a spectral

response of a reference standard according to claim 1, i.e. such step is not shown in Andersen.

Withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 has been rejected as obvious under Section 103 from Edgar in view of Rosenthal et al USP 4,761,552 ("Rosenthal"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The calibration standard of Edgar is attached to a sensing head of the gauge. The radiation first passes through an optical component B of the calibration standard and is optically diffused therein. The radiation is then reflected by a component E such that it appears to have been reflected from a surface at the position of the sample. Thus, the calibration standard may be applied to the gauge which is used to make measurements on a moving production line, such as a moving web of paper.

Accordingly, the person of ordinary skill in the art would be discouraged from making a calibration standard that imitates the scattering properties of a product to be analyzed. If the scattering properties were imitated, the desired diffusion could not be received and the calibration standard could not be applied to the gauge while arranged over a moving production line.

Rosenthal has not been cited to make up for the deficiencies of Edgar as pointed out above, and indeed does not do so. Therefore, even if the proposed combination were obvious, the resultant reconstruction of Edgar would not correspond to claim 5 which incorporates the subject matter of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 has been rejected as obvious under Section 103 from Edgar in view of Andersen; and claim 9 has been rejected as obvious under Section 103 from Edgar in view of Crozier et al USP 5,892,229 ("Crozier"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Again, as with claim 5 as pointed out above, claims 8 and 9 each depend from and incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. Neither Andersen nor Crozier have been cited to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of claim 1, and indeed do not do so. Therefore, even if the proposed combinations were obvious, respectfully not admitted by applicants, the resultant reconstructions of Edgar would not reach either of claims 8 or 9 by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted, along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their application against any of applicants' claims.

Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Official Action have been addressed above in a manner which should lead to patentability of applicants' claims. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By _____
Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:jec
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\A\Awap\Springsteen1\pto\AMD 23 Nov 05.doc